

UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE United States Patent and Trademark Office Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS P.O. Box 1450 Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450 www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FI	LING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/980,487	09/980,487 12/03/2001		Horst Mueller	1454.1118	5604
21171	7590	07/09/2004		EXAMINER	
STAAS &	HALSEY	LLP	DUONG, DUC T		
	SUITE 700 1201 NEW YORK AVENUE, N.W. WASHINGTON, DC 20005			ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
WASHING				2663	
				DATE MAILED: 07/09/2004	4

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

0	Application No.	Applicant(s)
Advisory Action	09/980,487	MUELLER, HORST
Advisory Action	Examiner	Art Unit
	Duc T. Duong	2663
The MAILING DATE of this communication appe	ars on the cover sheet with the c	orrespondence address
THE REPLY FILED 14 June 2004 FAILS TO PLACE TH Therefore, further action by the applicant is required to averinal rejection under 37 CFR 1.113 may only be either: (1) condition for allowance; (2) a timely filed Notice of Appeal Examination (RCE) in compliance with 37 CFR 1.114.	oid abandonment of this applicated abandonment of this applicated application application and applications.	ntion. A proper reply to a places the application in
PERIOD FOR RE	EPLY [check either a) or b)]	
a) The period for reply expires 3 months from the mailing date b) The period for reply expires on: (1) the mailing date of this A no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire I ONLY CHECK THIS BOX WHEN THE FIRST REPLY WAS 706.07(f). Extensions of time may be obtained under 37 CFR 1.136(a). The fee have been filed is the date for purposes of determining the period of fee under 37 CFR 1.17(a) is calculated from: (1) the expiration date of (2) as set forth in (b) above, if checked. Any reply received by the Office timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.17(a) is calculated from: (1) the expiration date of (2) as set forth in (b) above, if checked. Any reply received by the Office timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment.	Advisory Action, or (2) the date set forth ater than SIX MONTHS from the mailing FILED WITHIN TWO MONTHS OF THE date on which the petition under 37 CFI of extension and the corresponding amounth that the shortened statutory period for reply the later than three months after the mail	g date of the final rejection. HE FINAL REJECTION. See MPEP R 1.136(a) and the appropriate extension unt of the fee. The appropriate extension originally set in the final Office action; or
1. A Notice of Appeal was filed on Appellant's 37 CFR 1.192(a), or any extension thereof (37 CFF		
2. The proposed amendment(s) will not be entered be	ecause:	•
(a) they raise new issues that would require further	er consideration and/or search (s	see NOTE below);
(b) they raise the issue of new matter (see Note b		
(c) they are not deemed to place the application in issues for appeal; and/or	n better form for appeal by mate	rially reducing or simplifying the
(d) they present additional claims without canceli NOTE:	ng a corresponding number of fi	nally rejected claims.
3. Applicant's reply has overcome the following reject	tion(s):	
4. Newly proposed or amended claim(s) would canceling the non-allowable claim(s).	be allowable if submitted in a se	eparate, timely filed amendment
5. ☐ The a) ☐ affidavit, b) ☐ exhibit, or c) ☐ request for application in condition for allowance because: Se		dered but does NOT place the
6. The affidavit or exhibit will NOT be considered bec raised by the Examiner in the final rejection.	ause it is not directed SOLELY t	o issues which were newly
7. For purposes of Appeal, the proposed amendment explanation of how the new or amended claims we		
The status of the claim(s) is (or will be) as follows:		
Claim(s) allowed: 22-25.		
Claim(s) objected to:		
Claim(s) rejected: 14-21 and 26.		
Claim(s) withdrawn from consideration:		
8. The drawing correction filed on is a) app	roved or b)☐ disapproved by t	he Examiner.
9. Note the attached Information Disclosure Statemen		
10. Other:	Š.	TENT EXAMINES.



Continuation of 5. does NOT place the application in condition for allowance because: Regarding the Applicant's argument on page 5 with respect to the limitation "without frame detection", it is not understand how a decoder can perform the claim recited limitation of receiving and rate reduction without frame detection when the claim language called for the use of a frame. The specification does not show any enablement for such limitation. Furthermore, the exhibits, the contents of IEEE Draft P802.3z and Recommendation G.707, and fig. 1 does not demonstrated how a person of ordinary skill in the art would undertstand that no frame detection would be performed. Thus, the rejection remains held.